

Mr. Chairman, the editorial writers are even more wrong this time than they usually are. The vote to exclude the United States from the Commission was primarily a vote to silence the strongest voice on the Commission in favor of human rights. The United States has insisted that the commission tell the honest and unvarnished truth about human rights violations the world over. And some of the other nations on the Commission, such as China, Cuba, Viet Nam, Malaysia, Libya, Algeria, Saudi Arabia, and now Sudan, have problems with the truth.

Mr. Chairman, not only did this year's Human Rights Commission members vote for a "no-action motion" that prevented the Commission from even debating the human rights record of the People's Republic of China. It also voted for a resolution on Sudan that did not even mention the word "slavery," and for a resolution on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that did not mention human rights violations committed by the Palestinian Authority. I was there in Geneva with ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART—we are resented for sadly raising true issues.

Mr. Chairman, instead of excluding countries from the Human Rights Commission because they are too strong on human rights, the U.N. should be concerned about excluding governments that routinely engage in torture, extrajudicial killing, rape as an instrument of terror, forced abortion, forced sterilization, and other forms of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion. If being in arrears can result in the loss of a vote in the General Assembly—which is the rule—surely barbaric behavior should disqualify a nation from the U.N. Human Rights Commission. Without these important reforms, the Commission will be in grave danger of becoming, as our colleague Mr. DIAZ-BALART has observed, no more than a "club of tyrannies."

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment and a "yes" vote on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. TANCREDO

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. TANCREDO:

Page 16, strike line 21 and all that follows through line 10 on page 17.

Page 117, strike line 5 and all that follows through line 2 on page 119.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, during committee consideration of this bill, an en bloc amendment was adopted authorizing the \$67 million per year that it would cost the United States to rejoin UNESCO and added a sense of Congress provision that the President should renew the membership and participation of the U.S. in this organization.

My amendment would strike these provisions from the bill. I am well aware that several of my colleagues have argued that this agency has reformed itself over the past 15 years, but serious arguments against rejoining UNESCO remains. I believe that UNESCO can best be described as an organization in search of a mission. Unfortunately when it does stumble upon the mission, it is almost always one that is quite perverse.

As I mentioned just a minute ago, it would cost us some \$67 million per year to get back in; and I question whether this is a wise use of resources.

David Malone, the president of the International Peace Academy in New York and a former Canadian Foreign Ministry official, is not optimistic about the prospects for reform by the new Director General of UNESCO, Mr. Koichiro Matsuura of Japan, "the problem of UNESCO is that successive heads have turned it into a personal patronage machine, neglecting programs and bloating the staffing." Mr. Malone went on to say, "we used to all know what the UNESCO objectives were. Now nobody knows what UNESCO does beyond the World Heritage sites, and whoever consults UNESCO now on science?"

By the way, UNESCO is the organization that has charge of the man and the biosphere sites, another one of those peculiar entities that this House, by the way, has struck down several times.

An article from The New York Times from March of last year reported that the new director general plans to use millions of dollars of his organization's funds to help restore colonial Havana. It is not at all clear to me why we should be rejoining an organization which is promoting tourism in Cuba.

According to an independent audit by the Canadian government, UNESCO rarely evaluates the cost effectiveness of its programs or sets specific objectives. It is an annual budget of close to \$400 million. It continues to promote such things as the New World Information Order. This is the name of this organization, quote, "Presenting and Revitalizing Our Intangible Heritage" and "Planet Society, a Worldwide Exchange Network for a New Art of Living on Earth."

One of the arguments of the proponents of rejoining UNESCO appears to be based on the principle that the U.S. should be a member of every major organization in the United Nations. Mr. Chairman, in light of our summary exclusion from U.N. Eco-

nomic and Social Council, the International Narcotics and Drug Control Board and the Commission on Human Rights, now is the time to critically review our existing memberships in the United Nations organizations and not the time to rejoin another U.N. body at enormous expense.

Finally, the U.S. government now gives \$2 million to \$3 million annually to UNESCO in voluntary contributions to cover projects we believe to be worthwhile. If we were to rejoin, we would be obliged to fund the good and the bad alike.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), whose action was strongly approved by members of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for yielding time on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot say that UNESCO is the most important international body that has ever been created. I can say it is a credible international body. The United States chose to withdraw from UNESCO in the 1980s for a variety of reasons. Some stem from management styles; some stem from politicalization on several kinds of issues. But in each of these circumstances, there has been reform.

We object to not being reelected to another U.N. body and we may be, in the eyes of some, poor losers.

□ 1315

But the fact of the matter is, in UNESCO, we are a poor winner. We have achieved the objectives we wanted. Not to return implies that, when the United States gets its way, we continue to put our head in the sand.

It is interesting that Secretary of State George Shultz, who signed the withdrawal notice in the 1980s, now supports returning. There are 188 member nations of UNESCO. While UNESCO does have a cost, for the United States to say we cannot afford our share is a bit awkward for the world's wealthiest country.

I do acknowledge that there is a costliness of Paris. Having said that, France was our first ally. For the United States simply to be opposed to institutions in Paris is not a very credible circumstance.

Finally, let me say education, science, culture are esoteric. On the other hand, they matter in the world. For the United States of America to argue we are better off with empty chair diplomacy is an error if not an oxymoron. Therefore, for very decent, credible reasons that apply to UNESCO itself but also have ramifications for our whole role in international organizations in the world today, it is very